

file



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,493	06/18/2001	Michael Aaron Kaply	AUS920010544US1	4152

7590 03/12/2004

Duke W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, ANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2127

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/884,493

Applicant(s)

KAPLY ET AL.

Examiner

Anh T Nguyen

Art Unit

2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 1001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 13, line 29, "of present", should recite, -- of the present--,

Page 16, line 11, "such Netscape", should recite, -- such as Netscape.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The following claims are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 2, "The method of clam 1", should recite, --The method of claim 1--,

Claim 9, "sessions terminated", should recite, -- session is terminated--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonough et al., ("McDonough", US 5,991,878), in view of D. Kristol et al., ("Kristol", Network Working Group RFC 2109, "HTTP State Management Mechanism", 13 pages, February 1997).

Art Unit: 2127

As per **claim 1**, McDonough teaches a method in a data processing system for removing information, the method comprising: receiving a selection of information for removal from a history (e.g., cookies) generated by a browser, wherein the selection is received prior to a browser session (Fig. 2A, *step 1010*, col.1, line 35-36; col.3, lines 14-16); and the automatic removal of the history based on a limited duration (col.1, lines 45-47, *in accordance with an expiration time indication during a single browser session*).

However, McDonough does not specifically teach the automatic removal of the information from the history using the selection without requiring a user input responsive to a termination of the browser session.

Kristol teaches the automatic removal of the information from the history without requiring a user input by setting the expiration to zero causing the cookie to be discarded immediately (Page 5, Section 4.2.2) or setting the default behavior to discard the cookie when the user exits the session (Page 7, Section 4.3.1).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the method as taught by McDonough to include Kristol's teaching of removing the information from the history upon terminating the browser session. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to do so because the user does not have to remember to manually clear confidential data since the system automatically clears the confidential information so that each session will begin anew, thus protecting the privacy of the user (Page 16, Section 7.1).

As per **claims 2-4**, which is dependent on claim 1, McDonough teaches wherein the information is input by a user through a graphical user interface (*i.e. login display*) and the information includes at least one of a phone number, a credit card number, a social security number, an address of a user, a user identification, a password, and a personal identification number (Fig. 2A, *step 1040*, col.3, lines 42-44).

As per **claim 5**, which is dependent on claim 1, McDonough teaches the invention substantially as claimed. However, McDonough does not specifically teach wherein only the information is removed without destroying the integrity of other portions of the history. Kristol teaches wherein only the information (*i.e. social security number*) is removed without destroying the integrity of other portions of the history (Page 16, section 7.1, *User Agent Control*, “*to let the user decide which cookies, if any should be saved when the user concludes a window or session*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the invention as taught by McDonough to include the feature of removing confidential information without destroying the integrity of other portions of the history because the user may wish to access subsequent portions of the history which contain other useful information (Page 2, Section 3, *State and Sessions*).

As per **claim 6**, which is dependent on claim 1, McDonough teaches wherein the history includes a cookie file, a cache for storing data associated with Web pages, a location list, and a history list (Fig.1, *cookie memory, browser*; Fig.4, *WS Memory, Back-End Memory*).

As per **claim 7**, which is dependent on claim 1, McDonough teaches wherein the information is received as at least one string (col.2, line 51, line 65).

Claims 8-10 are similar in scope to claims 1-2, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11 and 23, are similar in scope to claim 1, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale. Additionally, McDonough teaches a data processing system comprising: a bus system; a communications unit connected to the bus system; a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; and a processing unit connected to the bus system (Fig.1).

Claims 12 and 24, are similar in scope to claims 11 and 23, and therefore rejected under similar rationale. However, McDonough does not specifically teach the removal of the information from the history in response to generation of the history. Kristol teaches to remove the information from the history using the selection in response to generation of the history (Page 16, Section 7.1, *User Agent Control*, “to determine whether a session is in progress, and to control the saving of a cookie”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the removal of information from the history in response to generation of the history because discarding the information would save a lot of storage space for other more frequently used information that does not contain confidential private data (Page 15, Section 6.3, *Implementation Limits*).

Claims 13-19 are similar in scope to claims 1-7, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 20-22 are similar in scope to claims 8-10, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a) McDonough et al., USPN 5,991,878 teaches controlling access to information in a browser session.
- b) Markus et al., USPN 6,490,601 discloses temporary cookies deposited into the user's browser program.
- c) Broadhurst et al., USPN 6,205,480 teaches using cookies that contain the user's identity for automatic user authentication.
- d) "Persistent Client State HTTP Cookies",
http://cgi.netscape.com/newsref/std/cookie_spec.html, 5 pages, 1997.
- e) "Cookies: what they are and how they work",
<http://help.netscape.com/kb/consumer/19970226-2.html>, 1 page, created 02/26/97.
- f) D. Kristol et al., Network Working Group RFC 2109, "HTTP State Management Mechanism", 13 pages, February 1997. ✓
- g) Microsoft Internet Explorer, Version 6.0, "Understanding Cookies", "Working with temporary Internet files", Copyright © 1995-2001 Microsoft Corp.

Art Unit: 2127

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh T Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8649. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5484.

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Anh T. Nguyen
Art Unit 2127
March 8, 2004

An